

REMARKS

Claims 1-20, 22-41, and 43-54 are pending. Claims 1, 13, 22, 34, 36, and 43 are amended. Claims 21 and 42 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer to be filed at a later date. The remaining claims are unchanged.

The amendments to the claims are supported by the application as originally filed, for instance, on page 13, paragraph 0044 through page 17, page 0051. No new matter has been added.

Rejection of Claims 1-7, 9-19, and 36-41 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-7, 9-19, and 36-41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Niblett et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,336,135 (“Niblett”).

Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn in view of the foregoing amendments and for the following reasons.

Claim 1 has been amended to define a computer-implemented method for selectively accessing one or more web services from a client machine, having the features of:

providing a first web service description language file describing synchronous operations for a web service;

translating the first web service description language file into a second web service description language file describing asynchronous operations;

receiving an indication of asynchronous communications as a preferred mode for communications between the client machine and at least one web service;

providing the second web service description language file to the client machine for generation of client machine code to interact with the at least one web service;

receiving a request for information from the client machine with a conversion engine, the request being received over a synchronous interface; processing the request in the conversion engine; and

transmitting the processed request over an asynchronous interface from the conversion engine to the at least one web service.

The Office Action states, on page 9, paragraph 28, “Niblett does not disclose that the file is a web service description language file.” Applicant agrees with this assessment of Niblett.

Because claim 1 has been amended as set forth above, to incorporate the use of first and second web service description language files, Applicant submits that amended claim 1 is not anticipated by Niblett, and requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 20, 21, 23-24, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 20, 21, 23-24, and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious in view of Niblett and Han et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 20020143819 (“Han”). Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn for the reasons below.

The Office Action cites Han for its description of a web service description language file. While Han mentions a web service language file, Han makes no mention of “providing a first web service description language file describing synchronous operations for a web service,” “translating the first web service description language file into a second web service description language file describing asynchronous operations,” “receiving an indication of asynchronous communications as a preferred mode for communications between the client machine and at least one web service,” and “providing the second web service description language file to the client machine for generation of client machine code to interact with the at least one web service,” as recited in claim 1. Indeed, there is no passage in Han that discloses or remotely suggests translation of web service description language files describing synchronous operations for a web service into web service description language files describing asynchronous operations, much less the additional above-quoted features of amended claim 1.

The Office Action, on page 9, paragraph 29, cites Niblett for its teachings of translating files describing synchronous operations to files describing asynchronous operations. Applicant disagrees. The cited passages of Niblett only mention a generalized goal of a computer program adapted for synchronous communication to communicate with an application adapted for asynchronous communication. (col. 6, lines 24-30). There is no disclosure or suggestion in Niblett of web service description language files, much less the translation and providing of web service description language files describing asynchronous operations, per claim 1.

The use of translated web service description language files describing asynchronous operations has benefits, as described in the application as originally filed, for instance, in paragraphs 0043 and 0044:

When a synchronous requestor would like to synchronously invoke a synchronous web service, the requestor can obtain the WSDL file describing the synchronous web service, bring the WSDL file into their computer system, which

parses the WSDL file and generates code on the requestor's computer system that can properly invoke the synchronous web service. However, as was seen in FIG. 3, many requestors communicate asynchronously and can therefore not benefit from the WSDL files that are designed for synchronous communication.

The invention solves this problem by translating a WSDL file published by a synchronous web service (110) with the integration services network (106) into a WSDL file that can be used by an asynchronous requestor. In one implementation, the translation of the WSDL file for a synchronous web service (110) occurs when the synchronous web service (110) registers in the directory (114) of the integration services network (106), or "on the fly," that is, the original WSDL file is stored in the integration services network (106) until a user indicates interest in using the synchronous web service (110), at which time a translated WSDL file is generated and distributed to the user. When a requestor indicates interest in using the synchronous web service (110), the integration services network (106) asks the requestor whether the requestor would like to use the web service (110) synchronously or asynchronously. If the requestor selects asynchronous use, the translated WSDL file is supplied to the requestor, where the translated WSDL file is used to generate the necessary client code.

Because embodiments of claim 1 address the above-described problem in a manner neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited art, the invention defined in claim 1 would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Han fails to cure the deficiencies of Niblett with respect to translated web service description language files, as recited in claim 1. Thus, the cited references, considered alone or in combination, fail to support the obviousness rejection. Accordingly, Applicant requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 22, 27-35, 42-53, and 54 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 22, 27-35, 42-53, and 54 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious in view of Niblett, Han, and Blair et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,065,082 ("Blair"). Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn for the reasons below.

Blair fails to disclose or suggest the features of: "providing a first web service description language file describing synchronous operations for a web service," "translating the first web service description language file into a second web service description language file describing asynchronous operations," "receiving an indication of asynchronous communications as a preferred mode for communications between the client machine and at least one web service," and "providing the second web service description language file to the client machine for generation of client machine code to interact with the at least one web service," as recited in claim 1. Indeed, there is no passage in Blair that discloses or remotely suggests these features.

Because there was no teaching, suggestion, or other reason in the cited art to combine Niblett, Han, and Blair, and even if these references could somehow be combined under 35 U.S.C. § 103, no such combination discloses all of the features recited in claim 1. Thus, this obviousness rejection is not supported by the cited art and should be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious in view of Niblett, Han, Blair, and Bowman, U.S. Patent No. 6,438,594 (“Bowman”). Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn for the reasons below.

Bowman fails to disclose or suggest the features of: “providing a first web service description language file describing synchronous operations for a web service,” “translating the first web service description language file into a second web service description language file describing asynchronous operations,” “receiving an indication of asynchronous communications as a preferred mode for communications between the client machine and at least one web service,” and “providing the second web service description language file to the client machine for generation of client machine code to interact with the at least one web service,” as recited in claim 1. There is no passage in Bowman that discloses or remotely suggests these features.

Because there was no teaching, suggestion, or other reason in the cited art to combine Niblett, Han, Blair, and Bowman, and even if these references could somehow be combined under 35 U.S.C. § 103, no such combination discloses all of the features recited in claim 1. Thus, this obviousness rejection is not supported by the cited art and should be withdrawn.

Independent claims 13, 34, and 36 have been amended to recite similar features as claim 1. Accordingly, the rejections of these claims should be withdrawn for similar reasons as claim 1.

The rejections of the dependent claims should be withdrawn for at least the same reasons as the independent claims on which the respective sets of dependent claims are based. Applicant submits that the dependent claims also recite additional patentable features.

Conclusion

Applicant believes the pending claims are allowable for the reasons above and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance. The Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below if the Examiner has any remaining questions or concerns regarding the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,
Weaver Austin Villeneuve & Sampson LLP

/John F. Griffith/

John F. Griffith
Reg. No. 44,137

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(510) 663-1100